

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KRISTIN DELLA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. 23-cv-04086-JCS

**ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL
UPON RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 78

The Court previously granted Defendant's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, dkt. no 78 ("Motion to Seal") in an order dated December 1, 2025. *See* dkt. no. 84. Upon reconsideration, the Motion to Seal is DENIED without prejudice. *See United States v. Vittaly*, No. C 04 3186 MHP, 2006 WL 3834229, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2006) ("A district court . . . has the power to reconsider sua sponte its orders prior to the entry of judgment."). With respect to the documents Defendant seeks to file in redacted form (the Declaration of Ronald T. Wilcox, Ph.D., the Declaration of Ran Kivetz, Ph.D., and its Opposition brief), Defendant did not supply "a proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material, **and which lists in table format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed.**" Civ.L.R. 79-5(c)(3) (emphasis added). Instead, the table in the proposed order (dkt. no. 78-2) lists only the two documents Defendant asks the Court to seal in their entirety (Exhibit F to the Declaration of Greg Corra in support of Colgate's Opposition to Class Certification and Exhibit P to the Omnibus Declaration of Kate T. Spelman).

Furthermore, Defendant did not provide in unredacted form either of the two exhibits sought to be sealed, instead filing in support of the Motion to Seal placeholder face pages for the two exhibits without the actual documents. *See* dkt. nos. 78-7 and 78-8. *See* Civ.L.R. 79-5(d)

1 (“Where the document to be sealed is a declaration or an exhibit to a document filed
2 electronically, an otherwise blank page reading “EXHIBIT FILED UNDER SEAL” shall replace
3 the exhibit in the document filed on the public docket, **and the exhibit to be filed under seal**
4 **shall be filed separately as an attachment to the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal.**”)
5 (emphasis added).

6 Therefore, the Motion to Seal is DENIED without prejudice to filing a renewed sealing
7 motion that corrects these errors.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: December 9, 2025

11 
12 _____
13 JOSEPH C. SPERO
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28